



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/420,787	10/19/1999	TED DANIELS	M3850.0029/P	3297

25096 7590 05/09/2003

PERKINS COIE LLP
PATENT-SEA
P.O. BOX 1247
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER

CHOW, DOON Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/420,787

Applicant(s)

DANIELS, TED

Examiner

Dennis-Doon Chow

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 6-16, 18-24, 26-28 and 31-34 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 6-16, 18-24, 26-28 and 31-34 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-4, 6-13, 15-16 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. (5400213) in view of Oka (5049863) and Merkel (5510953).

Honda discloses a portable personal computer, comprising: a base having a controller for controlling operations thereof; a display attached to the base; and a removable keyboard for communicating with the controller in the base through a signal interface when mounted into or removed from the base (see Figs. 1-2).

Honda does not disclose the signal interface being wireless.

Oka, in the same input field, discloses a removable input member for communicating with a base unit through a signal interface which includes a wireless infrared connection or a hardwired connection which includes a first and second connectors (Figs. 7, 9, 10). The removable input member includes a power supply for supplying power to the removable input member when the wireless communication is used (see Fig. 7).

Art Unit: 2675

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute Oka's wireless connection for Honda's hardwired connection because Oka teaches both wireless and hardwired connection can be used.

Honda does not explicitly disclose using the recess for receiving one side surface of the keyboard.

Merkel, in the same input field, discloses a mounting structure for mounting a removable keyboard into a computer base unit. The structure comprises a recess for receiving a side surface of the keyboard.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the Merkel's concept in Honda's invention because Merkel's mounting structure is very simple and it is ease to make.

Regarding claims 6-8, using a pointing device such a track ball or a touch pad in the keyboard is well known in the art.

Regarding to claims 11 and 15, using a radio frequency connection instead of the infrared connection in the wireless communication is well known in the art.

3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. in view of Oka and Merkel as applied to claims 2-4, 6-13, 15-16 and 18-21 above, and further in view of Brusky et al. (5903259).

The modified Honda does not disclose using two infrared devices.

Brusky, in the same input art, discloses using more than one infrared devices for transmitting infrared signals from a remote keyboard to a computer base unit (see Fig. 2), wherein each of the infrared devices is located in each side of the keyboard.

Art Unit: 2675

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Brusky's infrared devices in the invention of the modified Honda because more infrared devices provide better transmission.

4. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. in view of Oka and Merkel as applied to claims 2-4, 6-13, 15-16 and 18-21 above, and further in view of Klein et al (6205021).

The modified Honda does not disclose the use of a spring ball bearing.

Klein, in the same input art, discloses a mounting structure for mounting an input device into a computer base unit. The mounting structure comprises a spring ball bearing (38 Fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Klein's spring ball bearing in the invention of the modified Honda. By doing so, a good contact can be created between the keyboard and the base.

5. Claims 26, 28, and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. (5400213) in view of Oka (5049863).

Honda discloses a portable personal computer, comprising: a base having a controller for controlling operations thereof; a display attached to the base; and a removable keyboard for communicating with the controller in the base through a signal interface when mounted into or removed from the base (see Figs. 1-2).

Honda does not disclose the signal interface being wireless.

Oka, in the same input field, discloses a removable input member for communicating with base unit through a signal interface which includes a wireless

Art Unit: 2675

infrared connection or a hardwired connection which includes a first and second connectors (Figs. 7, 9, 10). The removable input member includes a power supply for supplying power to the removable input member when the wireless communication is used (see Fig. 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute Oka's wireless connection for Honda's hardwired connection because Oka teaches both wireless and hardwired connection can be used.

6. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. in view of Oka as applied to claims 26, 28, and 30-33 above, and further in view of Brusky et al. (5903259).

The modified Honda does not disclose using two infrared devices.

Brusky, in the same input art, discloses using more than one infrared devices for transmitting infrared signals from a remote keyboard to a computer base unit (see Fig. 2), wherein each of the infrared devices is located in each side of the keyboard.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Brusky's infrared devices in the invention of the modified Honda because more infrared devices provide better transmission.

7. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. in view of Oka as applied to claims 26, 28, and 30-33 above, and further in view of Klein et al (6205021).

The modified Honda does not disclose the use of a spring ball bearing.

Art Unit: 2675

Klein, in the same input art, discloses a mounting structure for mounting an input device into a computer base unit. The mounting structure comprises a spring ball bearing (38 Fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Klein's spring ball bearing in the invention of the modified Honda. By doing so, a good contact can be created between the keyboard and the base.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed February 28, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Honda and Oka fail to disclose a removable wireless keyboard that has a power supply independent of the base, and the power supply includes an external alternating current power adapter. The examiner disagrees. As indicated in the above rejections, it is clear that the combination of Honda and Oka teaches a removable wireless keyboard has a power supply independent to a base, and Oka teaches that the power supply is a battery. Although, Oka is silent on whether the battery is a non-rechargeable battery or a rechargeable battery which can be recharged by using an external AC power adapter, but it is well recognized in the art that the benefits of using the rechargeable battery as the power supply instead of using the non-rechargeable battery. One of the benefits for using the rechargeable battery is to save money over a period of time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to use the rechargeable battery with the external AC power adapter as the power supply in the remote keyboard instead of the non-rechargeable battery.

Applicant argues that Oka teaches away from adding an alternating current power adapter and the associated cable or cord to the key input unit. The examiner disagrees because of the reasons presented above and Oka also teaches using both wireless and wire communication means in the remote key input unit.

Applicant further argues that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to add an AC adapter and an associated power cord to a mouse because the purpose of a mouse is to provide a device with mobility to facilitate the ease with which a user inputs data. Using the AC adapter and the associated power cord in Oka's remote unit to charge up the rechargeable battery not necessary mean to reduce the mobility of the remote unit because the AC adapter and the associated power cord can be removed when the rechargeable battery is charged up.

For the above reasons, the rejections stand.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2675


shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis-Doon Chow whose telephone number is 703-305-4398. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00, Alternate Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras can be reached on 703-305-9720. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

D. Chow
May 7, 2003


DENNIS-DOON CHOW
PRIMARY EXAMINER